

The Church and the Jews

A Memorial
Issued by Catholic European Scholars



PRICE 10 CENTS

THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL PEACE
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

THIS study, which has been translated from the German by the Reverend Dr. Gregory Feige, is being issued as a report of the Committee on National Attitudes.

NATIONAL ATTITUDES COMMITTEE

Chairman

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Vice-Chairmen

REV. JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.
GEORGE N. SHUSTER

HERBERT C. F. BELL
FRANCES S. CHILDS
REV. JOHN M. COOPER
REV. GREGORY FEIGE
REV. ADOLPH D. FRENAY, O.P.
REV. FRANCIS J. GILLIGAN
REV. E. P. GRAHAM
D. L. MAYNARD GRAY
ELLAMAY HORAN
MAURICE LAVANOUX

SARA E. LAUGHLIN
ELIZABETH M. LYNKEY
MILO F. McDONALD
GEORGIANA P. McENTEE
REV. R. A. McGOWAN
FRANCIS E. McMAHON
REV. T. LAWRAZON RIGGS
REV. MAURICE S. SHEEHY
SISTER M. IMMACULATA, I.H.M.
SISTER MARY VINCENT
SISTER MIRIAM ALACOQUE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	4
<i>Theological Principles and the Jewish Question of Today:</i>	
IS YAHWE A JEWISH GOD OR IS ISRAEL GOD'S PEOPLE?.....	5
WAS JESUS THE FIRST ANTI-SEMITE OR THE TRUE JEW?.....	9
IS ISRAEL ETERNALLY DAMNED OR RESERVED FOR SALVA- TION?	12
ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE CHURCH.....	14
<i>The Political and Practical Side of the Jewish Question of Today:</i>	
PUNISHMENT OF THE JEWS FOR THEIR GUILT IN REJECT- ING CHRIST?	17
JEWISH LEGISLATION IN THE MIDDLE AGES.....	18
WHY IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO RETURN TO THE MEDIEVAL LEGISLATION FOR THE JEWS.....	19
THE DISSOLUTION OF CHRISTIAN PUBLIC LIFE.....	20
EMANCIPATION OF THE JEWS.....	21
RACIAL ANTI-SEMITISM	23
“NATIONALIST-CONSERVATIVE” ANTI-SEMITISM	24
A CHRISTIAN CRITICISM OF RACIAL ANTI-SEMITISM.....	26
CRITICISM OF THE “MODERATE” ANTI-SEMITISM.....	27
DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS.....	33
SIGNERS	34

PREFACE

THE following critical study was written for and first appeared in the Catholic Bi-monthly, "*Die Erfuellung*," a review edited by the Reverend Johannes Oesterreicher for the "*Pauluswerk*" in Vienna, Austria. The Pauluswerk labors for the conversion of the Jews as well as for a better understanding of Judaism and its adherents by Christians. It is especially in this latter phase of the work that Father Oesterreicher has been attempting a well-nigh superhuman task in Central Europe for the past few years. No one who has read the ably-written articles in his Magazine can fail to be impressed by its vibrant and vital Catholicism, its genuine piety, its passion for truth, justice and true Christian charity.

The original writers of the pamphlet prefer to remain anonymous, as do also a number of other distinguished Catholics of the clergy and laity who support it. As Father Oesterreicher explains: "Besides enjoying the support of the signers at the end of this document, it has received the approval of outstanding religious and of noted Catholic political leaders in various countries. The terrorism of our time compels the editor to omit publication of their names, in order not to jeopardize their safety or that of their friends or their relatives."

The American public is indebted to the *Catholic Association for International Peace* for its ready acceptance of the publication and distribution of this pamphlet through its COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL ATTITUDES, to whose Chairman, Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University, the writer wishes to express his thanks. It is felt that the rising tide of anti-Semitism in the United States makes an English version both timely and useful.

GREGORY FEIGE.

Jamaica, L. I.

Feast of St. Matthew (Levi), 1937.

The Church of Christ and the Jewish Question

THE confusion which exists in the minds of many Christians on the question of their attitude toward the Jews has been caused by the liberalistic "enlightenment," of the past two centuries and for several decades past (with a more notable intensification during the last few years) by a consciously or unconsciously anti-Christian anti-Semitism. In the face of this confusion, we consider it our Christian duty to bring back to mind the teaching of the Church of Christ insofar as it relates to this question, and to examine from this viewpoint the attempted answers and solutions which are propagated and applied today, especially in the Germanic countries.

I

THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES AND THE JEWISH QUESTION OF TODAY

Even as Satan tempted the Divine Saviour in the desert, so does he constantly tempt anew the Mystical Body of Christ in the desert of this world and time. Again, just as the Evil One dares to quote Scripture to the Redeemer Himself,¹ so does he not hesitate to lead the followers of Christ astray with biblical quotations. "The disciple," the Scriptures tell us, "is not above his master."² Thus the temptation to adopt false teaching and with it sinful action on the Jewish question becomes particularly enticing when it appears in a scriptural disguise. For this reason we shall develop below the three main errors now rampant in this field, examining them in the light of the very same quotations which purport to lend some justification to them.

1. *Is Yahwe a Jewish God, or Is Israel God's People?*

A Christian will hardly hold the crassest form of these errors, but there are many who consider themselves Christians who do hold them in a veiled form. These errors are seemingly supported by a passage from the Canticle of Moses.³

¹ Matt. iv. 6.

² Luke vi. 40.

³ Deut. xxxii. 8.

There, mention is made of the Almighty settling the people and separating the sons of Adam. This is followed by: "But the Lord's portion is His people: Jacob, the lot of his inheritance." From this, the so-called liberal Bible critics (and many unwary readers who in no way desire to be identified with the liberals), deduce openly that Jehovah—Yahwe, "the Lord" of our Bible translations, is not fully and essentially identical with the one true, the triune God, but only a preliminary and partial reflection or aspect of God, viewed through the obscured spectacles of the Jewish national character. More crudely expressed, this heresy means this: Yawhe is a Jewish God.

It is in last analysis unimportant in what form this heresy appears: whether in the synagogal form which claims the Yahwe of the Bible as the product of Hebrew culture; or whether in the rationalistic-liberalistic form which undertakes to demonstrate the "evolution" of a particularly "pure-God-idea" from the history of the Jews; ⁴ or finally, in an anti-Semitic form, according to which the special inferiority of the Jewish national character is reflected in a peculiarly abhorrent image of the Old Testament God which this people is said to have fashioned after its own likeness. The third form of this heresy, which would reduce Yahwe to the level of a tribal God, attracts increasingly wider circles today. Accordingly we find some writers declaring boldly that "Judaism's inner idea of God" constitutes "one essence with the Jewish exterior." From the species and "blood" of this "nomad" tribe and "parasite-people," the "desert demon" and "tyrant God" (which according to them is really what Yahwe represented), is supposed to have originated. According to others who express themselves in a more discreet manner, a people like the Jews deserved to have such a "Nomos," the despised Old Testament "law," which, therefore, could have no real meaning for any other and nobler people. It would be careless and superficial to assume that these heresies remain without influence upon Catholic Christians, because they cannot subscribe to such a teaching publicly. The fact is that such a teaching is publicly championed in numerous variations. Consequently, it would be a mistake to believe that a specific refutation, as

⁴ This is supposed to have been outmoded and surpassed by "progress," and, incidentally, was not achieved without the leading participation of a secularized assimilationist Jewry.

in the case of other errors, is not needed here. Rather, such a refutation must not be omitted.

The refutation of this heresy seems to be based on two utterances of Jesus Christ. One of these is to be found in the (allegedly) "anti-Semitic" Gospel of St. John. There it is written: "Search the Scriptures" (therefore the only Scriptures extant at that time, which we call today the Old Testament), "the same are they that give testimony of Me."⁵ Similarly, Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, refers to the books of the Old Covenant as the unchangeable word of God, restricted in no way by "blood and soil." "Do not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For amen I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass of the law till all be fulfilled."⁶ On the basis of the first as well as the second of these statements, no one who believes in Jesus Christ can deny that the Yahwe revealed in the Old Testament is identical with the true God and Father of Jesus Christ. For this reason the Church has repeatedly declared that "the God of the Old and the New Testaments is one and the same," as expressed in the Decree on the Jacobites in the 17th Ecumenical Council of Florence. Even in the fourth century, the bishop, before his consecration, was obliged to make this profession of faith: "I believe that the One Author of the Old and New Testaments, the Books of the Law, the Prophets and the Gospels, is the Lord Almighty."

It is indeed true that the people of Israel, at the time of the Old Covenant, differed from all other peoples of the world in the worship of Yahwe, the one true God, the Infinite Being of Infinite Mercy, the Lord and Helper, not because they followed their own course, but rather because they went the way of God. For this reason, Jesus said to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's Well: "You (the Samaritans and other heathens) adore that which you know not; we adore that which we know; for salvation is of the Jews."⁷ Whatever there may be of the human in the writings of the Old Testament or of Israel's character for good or for ill, the "image" of Yahwe is not in the least determined by any "Jewish national characteristic," or viewed through any "Jewish spectacles." For the Old Testament does not at all present to us

⁵ John v. 39.

⁶ Matt. v. 17, 18.

⁷ John iv. 22.

a manufactured mental or material "image"—Israel having been commanded: "Thou shalt not make thyself an image"⁸—but the self-revelation of God. On the other hand, it is a mark of pagan gods—the "nothings,"⁹ the illusions, which the people of ancient and modern times tried to fashion for themselves—to be determined by the character of the people in question. This character is likewise reflected in their mythology.

Yahwe, however, is the God of Abraham, not because Abraham has chosen Him but because He chose Abraham.¹⁰ He wishes to be known for all times as "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,"¹¹ because He has singled out these three as the first to come to His true worship from paganism, because "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live to Him."¹² For this reason also "the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God,"¹³ the God of Israel. Thus the Old Testament reveals its God as the God of all mankind *and* as the God of Israel. For Yahwe is truly the God of Israel, but only because He Himself has chosen, first, the patriarchs of old, and then, the people of Israel, in whose appearance He has set aside "a priestly kingdom and a holy nation."¹⁴ In the descendants of Abraham who had pleased Him well, He desired to realize His promise to show to the whole world what He expects of a people who are consecrated to His service.

To say, therefore, that Yahwe is a Jewish God is contrary to the truth, *i.e.*, contrary to our faith as revealed and contained in the Old and New Testaments which are one and inseparable. It is the opposite of this that we must rather confess: Israel is God's people. For this reason the Law of Israel is the command of God. Accordingly in its *spirit*, *i.e.*, insofar as this spirit is "our pedagogue in Christ."¹⁵ it is not in any way less binding on us Christians than on the people at Sinai. Only in the dead and deadening letter, *i.e.*, in the temporal applications of its eternal principles, has this law become for the most part pointless to all persons with a true understanding and naturally also to all true sons of Israel. Wherever it expressed a preparation for, or a "*De Profundis*" to, the Saviour, it found its fulfillment in the sacrificial death of Jesus; wherever it expressed bondage,¹⁶ it has been replaced,

⁸ Ex. xx. 4.

⁹ Is. ii. 18.

¹⁰ John xv. 16.

¹¹ Ex. iii. 15.

¹² Luke xx. 38.

¹³ Is. lii. 10.

¹⁴ Ex. xix. 16.

¹⁵ Gal. iii. 24.

¹⁶ Gal. iv. 24.

through the grace of God, by the spirit of adoption of sons,¹⁷ by which we are to obtain the liberty of the glory of the children of God.¹⁸ "I will not now call you servants, I have called you friends,"¹⁹ says Jesus.

The Synagogue, which, however, can never be recognized by the Church as the true Israel, still clings with unshakeable blindness to the dead letter of the law, just as it is represented symbolically by the famous blindfold statue on the Cathedral of Strassbourg. The Christian, on the other hand, whose fathers came from paganism, rejoices that the Revelation, which was once vouchsafed to Israel alone, has now been given to him also as a gift. For this reason Bishop Atto of Vercelli says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, according to His own words, did not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it,²⁰ and to show Himself in this way as the *one* Author of the Old as well as of the New Testament. The four gospels do not make the ten Commandments invalid but rather strive to confirm them. Those Ten Commandments were previously recorded by the Jews alone and kept confined; but then the Lord came to make them free and to proclaim them to all the four corners of the world."²¹

It is, therefore, the duty of every individual Christian who recognizes these truths, to defend them against all errors and to make them appear in their true light, especially among his fellow Christians. This must be done most energetically, wherever a false teaching about the God of the Old Testament is being propagated publicly and is believed in by poorly-informed Christians.

2. *Was Jesus the First Anti-Semite or the True Jew?*

The same may be said of the second error which is somewhat more subtle and is more openly held by those who claim to be Christians. This error maintains that Jesus was always in absolute opposition to the Jews. As proof of this, His word from St. John's Gospel is usually cited which says: "You are of your father, the devil."²² It must again be pointed out that it is of little moment whether the Synagogue uses this statement in order to ostracize Jesus as an apostate

¹⁷ Romans viii. 15.

²⁰ Matt. v. 17.

¹⁸ Romans viii, 21.

²¹ M. Pl. cxxxviii. 840.

¹⁹ John xv. 15.

²² John viii. 44.

Israelite; or whether a liberalistic interpretation sees therein merely an expression of the constantly recurring conflict between a "more progressive" and a "reactionary" principle; or whether anti-Semitism uses it as a devastating characterization of Judaism. To refute it, it is only necessary to read the context from which the quotation has been taken. Some Jews who do not believe in Jesus try to take His Life,²³ and in this connection Jesus declares: You (who seek to kill Me) are not the true sons of Abraham who took a right attitude toward the truth of God²⁴—but you are the sons of the devil, who was "a murderer from the beginning,"²⁵ just as every sinner of any people, insofar as he is a sinner, is a son of the devil who begot sin.²⁶

In His speech as found in St. John, Jesus Christ placed in opposition to the Jewish "sons of the devil" not the non-Jews, but rather the true sons of Abraham. Similarly, He elsewhere repeatedly confined His mission specifically to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel."²⁷ Jesus Christ loved His people. He wept when He saw an obdurate Jerusalem and answered: "If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace."²⁸ From the depth of His loving heart came the complaint: "How often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather the chickens under her wing, and thou wouldst not."²⁹ But even in this abandonment and loneliness in which the people of Israel have fallen on account of their hardness of heart, He does not leave them without consolation. He promises them that they shall find Him again and see His joy, as soon as they declare: "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."³⁰

Jesus Christ fought *for* and not *against* His people. He was as completely, consciously and unreservedly a Jew, as any one of them, as He Himself also specifically confessed to the Samaritan woman.³¹ Indeed, He was a Jew like none of them; the true *Jew*, the one and only true *Jew*, *just as He was*, and *because He was*, the only perfectly true man. For the true Jew, the "right Israelite," is determined by his fulfillment of the spiritual mission which God has given to His people, *i.e.*, to manifest to all men how the right man, the man

²³ John viii. 37.

²⁴ John viii. 40.

²⁵ John viii, 44.

²⁶ Gen. iii. 4.

²⁷ Matt. x. 6; xv. 24.

²⁸ Luke xix. 41, 42.

²⁹ Matt. xxiii. 31.

³⁰ Matt. xxiii. 38.

³¹ John iv. 22.

pleasing to God, should live and act. This alone is the true mission of Israel, that is to say of the physical sons of Abraham, and this the Apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul, also confirms in the Holy Ghost, "to whom belongeth the adoption as of children, and the glory, and the Testament, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises."³² St. Ignatius of Loyola fully realized this when he wished to be a Jew in order to resemble our Lord still more than was possible without being one.

Many Christians today, however, falsely consider Jewish descent a stigma and a disgrace. As certainly as we must reject any Judaistic error which may still be found in Judaism, according to which some visible condition, however slight (whether referring to physical descent or to the keeping of the Law), is necessary for salvation; as certainly as the approach to the Holy of Holies is open to all, since that hour when at the death of Christ the veil of the Temple was rent from top to bottom; and as certainly as there is no regard of persons before God, in the same way it is quite certain that the people of Israel, as well as every individual Israelite, should be an object of pious awe to the Christian for the simple reason that the Logos became Man in Israel. Even as the Christian loves the land which bears the footprints of the Lord, so also should he love the people among whom the Lord was born. Just as it grieves him if the holy places are devastated by the heathen, so also his love of Christ will sadden and trouble him when he sees the devastation which the rejection of Christ has brought on the people of Israel. Viewed from the point of such a strong love of Christ, the wish of St. Ignatius can well be understood.

Jesus was a Jew. Nothing can alter this fact; nothing can explain it away. If today many are scandalized by this fact that Jesus, according to the flesh, came from Israel, a people despised by the world, then the clear statement of our Lord must be applied here: "Blessed is he who shall not be scandalized in Me."³³ He is, as Simeon witnesses, the glory of His people Israel,³⁴ but this must not be misunderstood in a national or racial sense. Among the ancestors of Jesus there are two women who were pagans, one of whom, Ruth, spoke these words: "Thy people shall be my people and thy God,

³² Romans ix. 4.

³³ Luke ii. 23.

³⁴ Luke ii. 32.

my God.”³⁵ This appears to foreshadow the coming Kingdom of God, the new Israel, in which there would be neither male nor female.³⁶ The Church, which is the new Israel, is a community of Jews and Gentiles, since Christ Who is our Peace has broken down the middle wall of partition and made both one.³⁷ Therefore it is not only false for the “Aryan” to be scandalized in Jesus of the House of David, but also for the Jew who, instead of humbly submitting to Him through faith, claims Him as the Great One of his people. Jesus of Nazareth is and remains the *King* of the Jews, but in no wise is He the King of the *Jews only*.

Even as Jesus Christ loved His people so did His apostles; they did not forget Israel, not even in its unbelief. Witness the sermons, prayers, and adjurations in which St. Peter addressed the people of Israel, according to the Acts of the Apostles. Witness the grief and sadness of St. Paul who besought God with unfathomable charity to bestow salvation on his kinsmen in the flesh instead of on himself.³⁸ Witness the desire of his heart and his prayer to God for their salvation.³⁹

3. Is Israel Eternally Damned or Reserved for Salvation?

But has not Israel forfeited its original divine election by rejecting its Redeemer? Do not the Israelites, insofar as they have remained unconverted, fall forever under the curse which they called down upon themselves when “the whole people answering said: His blood be upon us and upon our children”?⁴⁰ This is incorrect and can be refuted with texts from the same Bible. For how did Jesus Christ reply to this self-inflicted curse of His people? “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”⁴¹ Similarly, what is it that the Holy Ghost reveals to us through the Apostle, St. Paul, about the future of the people of Israel? “Blindness in part has happened in Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles should come in. And so all Israel should be saved, as it is written.”⁴²

The question: “Has God rejected His people forever?” is answered by St. Paul most emphatically: “God forbid.”⁴³ For this reason he cautions the Gentile-Christian recipients of

³⁵ Ruth i. 16.

³⁶ Gal. iii. 28.

³⁷ Eph. ii. 14.

³⁸ Romans ix. 2, 3.

³⁹ Romans x. 1.

⁴⁰ Matt. xxvii. 25.

⁴¹ Luke xxiii. 34.

⁴² Romans xi. 25.

⁴³ Romans xi. 1.

his letter who were tempted to look with contempt on the fallen people of Israel: "Be not high-minded, but fear. For if God hath not spared the natural branches (of His holy tree), fear lest perhaps He also spare not thee (the ingrafted branch)." ⁴⁴ Concerning this the Exegete Friedrich Wilhelm Meier of Breslau declares that whoever sits in judgment over Israel with a complex of religious and moral superiority, "relinquishes the Christian doctrine of the complete surrender to the unmerited act of God's mercy by which we receive grace, and therefore, such a one is no longer a believer but an unbeliever." ⁴⁵

Even though terrible tribulations must come over Israel, by which God has tried Israel in the past, tries Israel today and may continue to do so in the future, yet these trials do in no way mean that He has rejected His people. "No, for the very reason that He called Israel to His own sonship out of all the nations of the earth, He also punishes it all the harder, according to Amos, for all its sins. The small person may well receive forgiveness out of pity, the powerful, however, will be powerfully tried in their judgment." ⁴⁶ The tribulations signify only this: God pleads to win His people; and the greater their opposition the warmer and fiercer His pleading becomes. "All the day long have I spread my hands to a people that believeth not, and contradicteth me." ⁴⁷ All the unspeakable misery of Israel only arouses God's irate love which grows the greater, the more Israel becomes, in part, obdurate against Him in arrogant pride or (what is in no wise better) bows in false humility to the letter of His Law whose spirit and meaning it continues to deny. The word of the Lord is still true: "Thou art My servant Israel, for in thee will I glory. Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb? And if she should forget, yet will not I forget thee." ⁴⁸

For this reason one may see in the terrible events in Central Europe since 1933 not only a warning of God to His people, without, however, trying to condone them in the least, but a warning, too, to a Christendom grown indifferent. This was

⁴⁴ Romans xi. 20s.

⁴⁵ *Israel in der Heilsgeschichte*, Münster, i. W. 1929, p. 134.

⁴⁶ Eßer-Mausbach, *Religion, Christentum, Kirche*. II, p. 55.

⁴⁷ Romans x. 21; Is. lxv, 2.

⁴⁸ Is. xlix. 3; xlix. 15.

expressed in 1933 in a letter to the editor of *Religioese-Besinnung*, by a Jewish writer who asks: "Is not this the time in which Israel must acknowledge Jesus Christ? Is not our suffering today a means to open up at last the Revelation of Christ to the Jews?"⁴⁹ No one can approach the Jewish question of our day without expressing disappointment and sorrow that, by and large, Judaism did not see in the persecutions of recent years—in harmony with the constant warnings of the prophets—a reason for self-examination and conversion to God and His anointed. Unfortunately most of them see in the happenings since 1933 nothing more than a materialistic, nationalistic self-determination. They persist in clinging to a God-forgetting humanitarianism. This, indeed, has been encouraged by the attitude of many Christians who have kept silent in the face of injustice; all this is, humanly speaking, regrettable. By this silence they do not save themselves, but on the contrary, since the Jewish question is not one of human tactics or political considerations, they add new tortures to the old, since there can be no other Saviour for Israel than the triune God. On the other hand, for him who has realized this clearly, sorrow and disappointment will be equally strong at the attitude of those who call themselves Christians but who, in all their actions, do not recall the Jew Christ, and who do not profess Him by the rôle of the Good Samaritan.

4. *Anti-Semitism in the Judgment of the Church*

Ceaselessly and tirelessly the true Israel, which is the Church of Christ, must announce the truth to the Jews. Being "all things to all men," an apostle must be particularly "a Jew to the Jews."⁵⁰ He must show to them the fulfillment of the Messianic salvation prophesied to them by his word of faith and his deed of love, by doctrine and example. To show such apostolic zeal and action, all of us, whether priests or laymen, have been called. Inasmuch as all Christians have a part in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church, the same admonition which the Canon Law of the Church⁵¹ recommends in a special manner to bishops and pastors, applies also to them, namely, that all non-Catholics too (and we may add, last but not least the Jews) have been entrusted to their care by God. It is necessary to remember what Peter

⁴⁹ *R.B.*, final ed., p. 55.

⁵⁰ 1 Corinthians ix. 20.

⁵¹ Canon 1350.

the Lombard has said: "If the Jews do not persist in unbelief they will again be ingrafted; but one may not despise them for this reason."⁵² We must endeavor, as far as possible, to help realize that for which we pray with the Church on Good Friday: that the "unbelieving Jews should recognize our Lord Jesus Christ."⁵³

Apart from the immediate act of charity which is an obligation for every individual Christian, there still remains the task of the Church as such. She is the "pillar and ground of the truth,"⁵⁴ of both the supernatural as well as the natural truth. While her primary mission consists in transmitting salvation to all men as children of God, she must also take special care that man shall not have the very foundations of his existence shaken and thus be deprived of his greatest possibility, namely to be *capax dei*. The Church of that God Who became man and Who took upon Himself our weaknesses, cannot forget the affairs of present-day mankind. Insofar as the Church is the custodian of human values, she is the most reliable, and soon perhaps the last refuge for the dignity of man, who is fashioned to the likeness of God; and insofar as the Church ultimately interprets the Natural Law and guarantees to it respect (that Natural Law, namely, which insists that all human rights be given to all beings human), she will unceasingly demand that the rights of the Jew, as a human being, shall not be violated and trampled under foot. The Church defends the rights of man and must defend them because she knows that they are not human but God-given rights, even if all nations of a secularized "Christianity" should join in the cry: "Down with the Jews!"—(Juda verrecke!). The Church which is named after Jesus, the Christ of the House of David, cannot do otherwise than exclaim: "Peace upon Israel."⁵⁵

At the same time, however, the Church will have to warn the faithful against the heresy of racialism. This false doctrine is derived from a naturalistic picture of man, which is altogether irreconcilable with the Christian faith. Once such

⁵² M. Pl. 191, 1488.

⁵³ The expression "*perfidii*" which the Church uses in its prayer on Good Friday does not signify "disloyal, treacherous, perfidious," but only "unbelieving," according to Erik Peterson, based on his linguistic study of the Fathers, as well as on the translation of the scholarly Cardinal of Milan, Ildefonse Schuster; v. *Ephemerides Liturgicac*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1936, pp. 296-311.

⁵⁴ 1 Tim. iii. 15.

⁵⁵ Psalms cxxiv. 5.

an image of man has found entrance into the ideology of the people by way of ostracizing the "Jewish race," it will lead to further consequences: naturalistic methods of breeding; destruction of so-called valueless life, *i.e.*, the killing of the incurable and the feeble; cultural autarchy with regard to Catholic Christianity and the introduction of a national or tribal religion and a tribal morality. Since racialism tries to destroy man as an individual responsible in conscience to God, it necessarily threatens to disrupt the Mystical Body of Christ. This heresy denies not only the created unity of mankind, but logically also its oneness in sin and salvation. Thus racialism becomes a mortal enemy of the Gospel and the Church. Whoever permits any compromise with this heresy cannot develop a true resistance to its terrible consequences.

In the performance of her mission and in the face of the errors of our times, the Church has solemnly declared and confirmed the following by a decree of the Holy Office of September 25, 1928: "The Catholic Church habitually prays for the Jewish people who were the bearers of the divine revelations up to the time of Christ; this, despite, indeed on account of, their subsequent blindness. Actuated by this love, the Apostolic See has protected this people against unjust oppression and, just as every kind of envy and jealousy among the nations must be disapproved of, so in an *especial* manner must be that hatred which is generally termed anti-Semitism." Confronted with this unequivocal declaration of the Church, one must reject most peremptorily any attempt to find a "Christian" or an "ecclesiastical" justification for anti-Semitism. By disapproving of the hatred against the Jews and condemning it as irreconcilable with the Gospel, the Church professes her own charity toward the people of Israel. She expects and demands, therefore, that every Christian individual and every Christian nation treat the people of Israel according to the words of our Lord: "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them."⁵⁶

This ecclesiastical and scriptural answer to the modern "Jewish Question" will have to be the basis of every secular attempt at a solution of this question which Catholic Christians might undertake at all or with which they might coöperate.

II

THE POLITICAL AND PRACTICAL SIDE OF THE JEWISH
QUESTION OF TODAY1. *Punishment of the Jews for Their Guilt in Rejecting Christ?*

TO THE Christian who ought to be a "doer of the word and not a hearer only,"⁵⁷ there remains the question of the practical conclusions to be derived from the above-stated Christian principle concerning our understanding of the Jewish question.

In the face of the fact, established beyond a doubt for the believing Christian, of the Jews' rejection of the Messiah, the question arises whether a special treatment of the Jews is justified on account of this historical conduct. Since Israel, according to Christian conception, holds a special position in history, which is a privileged position based on its irrevocable election, it is maintained by some that it should now also have a negatively privileged position, because it was unfaithful to its true mission. It is argued that the Jews have crucified Christ and called upon themselves and their descendants the blood of the Saviour. That by their rejection of the true Messiah they have retarded the progress of salvation's history and prolonged the period of waiting and suffering for mankind. That God remains true to His prophecies and cannot be corrected by history; that He will wait for the conversion of His elected Jews; and that thus, the end of the world, which brings with it the visible return of our Lord and the subjugation of all His enemies, depends on the conversion of the Jews. (This idea was propounded recently by Léon Bloy in his book, "*Le Salut Par Les Juifs.*") For this reason, some conclude (in opposition to Bloy, who rejects anti-Semitism most emphatically), that: first of all, the Jews should be punished for the sins of their ancestors who refused to accept the proposal of the Roman Governor to acquit Christ and thereby became guilty of His death on the Cross; secondly, that care should be taken not to allow the Jews to forget their historical position by a tranquil and secure life or by occupying influential and prominent posts; it should be incumbent on them to convert themselves; thirdly,

⁵⁷ James i. 22.

that their position should not be allowed to be comfortable because the cessation of the historical time of tribulation, that time between all Time, depends upon the conversion of the Jews to the true Messiah; by definitely renouncing all Messianic substitutes such as financial power, belief in a terrestrial reign of peace, Socialism, Communism, *et al.*

2. *Jewish Legislation in the Middle Ages*

These views really decided the attitude of the Christian world in the Middle Ages. Father Petrus Browe, S.J., in his monograph, "The Jewish Legislation of Justinian,"⁵⁸ states that the following theses, referring to the Jewish question, were fundamental in the Middle Ages: the rejection and crucifixion of the Messiah rests like a curse on the whole people and continues to act like an hereditary guilt; all Jews, good or bad, must carry this burden. For this reason, plus an apologetic one, they as well as their religion were to be tolerated,⁵⁹ but as an alien people they had to live under special and strict laws, promulgated by the State and the Church, and had to be subservient to Christians. This applied to all Jews, regardless of the fact whether they were personally good or bad. But they were not to be molested or oppressed beyond this. And so we find Popes, Bishops and Emperors of the past protecting the Jews against the fanaticism of an aroused populace and against the greed for money of princes and cities. Sincerely converted Jews who had relinquished their religion and nation escaped this curse which had rested upon them and were admitted into the Church as fully qualified members.

The special treatment of the Jews in the Middle Ages was evidently a natural corollary to the existing Christian philosophy pervading all public life. The special laws against the Jews were in harmony with the laws against heretics and apostates who were treated even more severely than the Jews, because their religious views were not tolerated. The purely religious motivation of the special laws directed against the Jews is clearly seen in the attitude toward the honestly converted Jew who was regarded as a member of the Christian nation and not considered any longer as an "alien."

⁵⁸ *Analecta Gregoriana*, Vol. VIII, Romae, 1935, p. 146.

⁵⁹ (Later on, Father Browe mentions the teaching that the final conversion of the world at the end of time will depend on the coming conversion of the Jews.)

3. *Why it is Impossible to Return to the Medieval Legislation for the Jews*

From the foregoing it follows, that whosoever attempts to justify any special legislation for the Jews, by referring to the attitude of the Church during the Middle Ages, must also attempt to restore the whole public morality of the Middle Ages. It is impossible to praise the legislation for Jews as the only worth-while thing for our times or to cite it in support of present-day legislation against the Jews and yet neglect to mention at the same time the similar laws against heretics and apostates; or to omit the fact of the close relation existing between the public order and the Church and her teaching. It is impossible to postulate a secularized State as the proper and immutable order and at the same time to demand for the Jews special laws which were derived from a Christian philosophy applicable to the public life of a Christian State. Whoever acts thus merely demonstrates the fact that he is not at all concerned about the Jewish question from the Christian point of view, but considers it merely as a secular, economic, and purely worldly matter. He subscribes to a different definition of the Jew from that prevalent in the Middle Ages.

The *ordo Christianus* of the Middle Ages, which laid down the principles for canonical Jew-laws along with many others, does not exist today. It would be a mistake to try to restore this order by way of restoring the Jewish laws. The noted Thomist, Jacques Maritain, shows distinctly in his books⁶⁰ that this medieval order is not even the ideal form in which Church and the Christian-in-the-world can be posited. It is contrary, moreover, to the will of the Church which has rescinded all canons referring to the Jews or those restricting their liberty, in the new Canon Law of 1917.⁶¹

⁶⁰ *Gesellschaftsordnung und Freiheit*, Luzern, 1936; and *Humanisme Integral*, 1936.

⁶¹ Jacques Maritain, commenting on the above exposition, desires to add some statements regarding the medieval conception of "retribution" for the redemptive-historical guilt referred to above. He writes: "Such retrIBUTions belong to God and not to man. If it should be claimed that they are inflicted in the name of God, it is a blasphemous impersonation of Providence. The Middle Ages did not pretend to *punish* the Jews, but in the face of the punishment to which God had subjected them, namely their dispersion among the Christian nations, it was considered justifiable to keep them under special and severe laws within the Christian communities. (*Cf.* the legislation referred to by Father Browe.) It was never a question of punishing the Jews but rather of drawing certain conclusions affecting the public law from a given fact, which was on the whole considered a punishment of God. I would like to have seen it more clearly explained in the treatise and to

4. *The Dissolution of Christian Public Life*

The Middle Ages lived according to the consciousness that the Jew was a special phenomenon in the history of man's Redemption. This fact alone explains the special medieval position of the Jews. With the secularization of the whole Christian philosophy the grounds for any special legislation against the Jews disappeared. In the eyes of the believer in a humanistic intellectualism, the Jews were first of all human beings who were entitled to common rights of man. The Jews were not leaders in the movement for secularization as a "Liberation of Thought and Public Life from the theological and ecclesiastical chains," and Spinoza is a singular and exceptional case. It is true, however, that the Jews played a considerable part in the subsequent process of disintegration. It is hardly necessary to prove that it was well-known non-Jews who contributed mostly toward this "disintegration" of the Christian public order and the faith. The long list of French Enlightenment, English Rationalists and German Liberal Protestants proves this. Voltaire, Rousseau, Hume, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Schopenhauer, Feuerbach, David Friedrich Strauss, Nietzsche, materialists like Moltke, Vogt, Buechner, Haeckel, the monists Ostwald and Drews who dared even to deny the existence of Jesus, were neither Jews nor of Jewish descent.

The breakdown of the old traditions is blamed also indirectly on the Jews, namely on the modern capitalistic economy which, according to Werner Sombart, had its origin in the character of Judaism. The final word of reply to this group of questions belongs to sociological and religious history. Its founder, Max Weber, ascribed the origin of the capitalistic spirit to Calvinistic Protestantism and Sombart himself, on another occasion, ascribed it to Medieval Catholicism. Both views have been refuted by R. H. Tawney,⁶² Bernard

have it brought out with greater emphasis, that today the medieval solution is not merely factually but also *juridically* unacceptable to us. For, there is a constantly progressing differentiation between matters spiritual and temporal, and there is an increasing recognition of the moral values of a purely human tolerance which was acquired in modern times. Under present-day conditions a Christian State (whose Christianity is not just a show or sham) would have to grant full civic and political equality to all its members, even though this would entail a juridical pluralism which I have endeavored to describe elsewhere (v. "Freedom and the Social Order," *Vita Nova*, Lucerne, p. 48). All of the members, whatever their spiritual allegiance may be, are equally invited to have a share in and give their coöperation for the same temporal good and to enjoy the same political *convivium*.

⁶² "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," 1926.

Groethuysen,⁶³ and J. B. Kraus, S.J.,⁶⁴ who decisively weakened the assertion of their close connection. Ernst Troeltsch has shown that the essential capitalistic traits, on account of certain definite sociological causes, originate with all sects and religious minorities. These statements, however, are not intended to minimize the above-mentioned fact of the Jews' participation in the process of dissolution from the second half of the 19th century down to our own times by their publicistic activities, by utilization of their economic power, and by coöperation of many Jews with anti-religious and revolutionary movements. This is said, in spite of the statement of Eric Peterson, who writes: "The Christian nations who lose their faith, degenerate into a state of savagery and soullessness to a far greater extent than is possible among the Jews."⁶⁵

5. *Emancipation of the Jews*

Neither Jew nor part-Jew played a leading rôle in the French Revolution which first put into effect the measures that became typical for Jewish emancipation, *i.e.*, liberation from anti-Jewish statutes. The belief that the Jew was first of all a human being, and as such entitled to full citizenship in the land in which he lived, was associated with the tendency to view Judaism as a purely internal matter, *i.e.*, a private creed or transitory state which would eventually disappear. Polemics against the Jews were justified by the argument that they did not wish to be assimilated although, it was generally assumed, they could do so. It was not only Jews like Heine, who coined the notorious cynical formula that Baptism provided the Card of Admission into European society, and who regarded conversion to Christianity merely as an avowal of adherence to Europe's cultural and national life. Thus, for example, the German friends of the Jewish classical scholar, Bernays, could not understand it when the latter declined to have himself baptized, thereby forfeiting a successful career as a university professor. Many non-Jews of the 19th century held the view that baptism should terminate visibly the particularized status of the Jews and should

⁶³ "Die Entstehung der buergerlichen Lebens-und Weltanschauung in Frankreich," 1927.

⁶⁴ "Scholasticism, Puritanism, Capitalism," 1931.

⁶⁵ "The Church of Jews and Gentiles," Salzburg, 1933, p. 62.

constitute the means and proof of their assimilation. Paul de Lagarde, who rejected a "purely external renunciation" of Judaism, called upon the Jews in 1881 to renounce the Synagogue "with its grotesque rites" as a preliminary condition for their reception into the Germanic community. This he held to be quite possible, nor was he opposed to mixed unions between Jews and Gentiles, as is shown in his Program of the Conservative Party of Prussia in 1884. He states there that such unions could "thus result in German progeny and the uninformed could have no idea that these descendants of a mixed ancestry were anything else but pure German children." Treitschke,⁶⁶ who, according to Erich Voegelin, made anti-Semitism socially acceptable, complained in 1880 that the emancipation of the Jews had made the "mixtures of blood" more difficult: "The number of conversions (of Jews) to Christianity has decreased considerably," and for this reason there had also been a corresponding decline of mixed marriages. By their sympathizers, too, the Jews were evaluated according to their acceptance of Western civilization with its Christian culture and tradition, which was considered tenable even for the unbaptized. In his dictated Diaries of 1881, dealing with the anti-Jewish agitations of his day, Leopold von Ranke recounts that in his conversations with Jewish students:⁶⁷ "All those who agreed with me (hence the Jews, too—Ed.) I declared to be historical Christians, since they must needs have accepted the ideas of the Middle Ages and of the more modern times all of which are based on Christianity."

The secularized conception of the Jew which sees in him a different being merely insofar as he belongs to a group formerly placed under special laws, or insofar as he still adheres to a particular creed which increases the difficulties of his assimilation, seems to work itself out completely in the Jew's favor. For it bestows on him rights, opens up for him life in public, "emancipates" him as a human being from the Ghetto in which the Middle Ages had confined him because he belonged to a society guilty of crucifying Christ and still unrepentant. The problem of the Jew's life and existence within any community accordingly lies in his ability to become

66 "Remarks on Our Jewry."

67 "Historische Zeitschrift," 1935, Vol. 151, p. 332.

assimilated. This we, too, affirm in principle. Yet there remains just this one question, to which the answer has to be found: What must a Jew do in order to become a full German, Frenchman, Englishman, etc., nay, to be fully *man* (without the “chosen people” delusion)?

6. *Racial Anti-Semitism*

Secularism, however, can also bring about (indeed it has already done so) the most vehement attacks against the Jew. This must be the case whenever mankind is not considered as a unit conditioned by reason, but when reason, humanity and honor are tied up with a certain “blood,” when race is something that belongs to humanity as a whole and a certain race to a particularly high type of humans. In such views the Jews appear as representatives of an “anti-race,” *i.e.*, they are the bearers of a blood composition which makes them the foes of true humanity, the destroyers of healthy and noble racial and national components with their dependent creations; taken in the widest sense, from politics to lyrics. Consequently, it is said, that they have to be placed under special laws which, according to these anti-Semites, will prevent the Jews from exercising their disintegrating and dissolving influence. The fact that the Jews are only gradually to be removed from their various positions is due to the damage that a sudden removal would inflict not merely on them, but on many non-Jews as well who have been obliged to live with them or did so in complete ignorance of this Jewish influence. Such a racial anti-Semitism is radically different from the “anti-Semitism” of the Christian Middle Ages: (1) A Jew in this view is determined by his blood composition and not by his attitude toward Christ and the whole redemption-history position connected with it. The Jewish religion plays a part in the definition of the Jew only insofar as it helps to determine a Jewish descent. Accordingly, a Jew is someone who has had Jewish ancestors, *i.e.*, ancestors who professed the Jewish religion. It makes no difference whatever, whether a Jew has been baptized or not; this is a “private affair” within the circle of a pronounced racial community. (2) Contrary to medieval conceptions, the Jew cannot become a convert. On account of his blood composition with its corresponding spirit, he remains

the harmful "alien," whereas in the Middle Ages every honest convert, *i.e.*, every Jew who professed belief in Christ, became a full-fledged member of the Church and hence also of the Christian community.

It is significant for the medieval Christian view that it opposed the attempts by Jews to become sham-converts for the purpose of obtaining temporal advantages; but this fight against feigned conversions was directed not only against the Jews, as in the notable example of the Marranos, *i.e.*, the Jew-Christians of Spain, but also against the former Moslems, the Moriscos, who were also often accused of having joined the Church for the sake of appearances only. But the Jew of racial anti-Semitism is not the Jew of biblical history against whom medieval legislation was directed, and to be consistent, racial anti-Semitism must also reject the Old Testament as a creation of the "disruptive Jewish spirit" or strive "to prove" in some magical manner that it is not really Jewish, but purloined, perhaps, by the Jews from some other nation, etc. It is, therefore, inadmissible for the raceist to acknowledge the Jews as the Chosen People, or the history of the Redemption as a historical reality of moment. This is to be reserved for the "history" of the race, just as for the Rationalist the so-called cultural or intellectual background or "environment" used to be considered the all-decisive factor.

7. "Nationalist-Conservative" Anti-Semitism

The modern anti-Semitism which looks upon the Jews primarily as a secular and social group is in no way bound to be as systematic and consistent as the narrower racial anti-Semitism. This latter animates the National Socialist decrees. We have already pointed out the tendency to consider the Jewish question a national one, *i.e.*, a question of relationship between the Jew and his national-political environment. This consideration rests on the viewpoint regarding the assimilability of the Jews, *i.e.*, regarding the temporary or unimportant internal nature of their peculiar status. All that is necessary, is just a slight shift of emphasis, depending on the part played by racial anti-Semitism (which denies assimilability in principle), and it will at once become clear that the non-adjustability of the Jews is not an accident, nor a temporary

phenomenon, but the expression of a nationally different character.

The representatives of a "moderate" national anti-Semitism are of the opinion that a real difference between their view and that of racial anti-Semitism is established by the fact that a nation is determined, neither by racial nor hereditary factors alone but rather, or solely, by its history and tradition. The Jew, therefore, is looked upon not merely as a natural, *i.e.*, a purely anthropological phenomenon (at least not by the Christian representatives of this kind of anti-Semitism), but as a corruptor of good Christian tradition, as a symbolical representative of modern secularism (with its spearhead against the Church), of which he is the chief beneficiary and promoter. Thus he may be said to continue to play the same rôle today that he played at Christ's Crucifixion; and although he may not always be subjectively conscious of this, he still does so objectively. Thus this anti-Semitism, which is founded on a national necessity, is also said to be necessary for religious reasons. The conversion of the Jews is not denied in principle by the exponents of this kind of anti-Semitism; but in practice, unfortunately, such exponents look very skeptically on the possibility of Jews becoming real and honest converts.

The proponents of this view, while rejecting racial anti-Semitism in principle, support it nevertheless in practice, or at least they find grounds for excusing it, even though they may repudiate the term anti-Semitism for themselves, since they claim to be merely defending themselves. They profess full sympathy, of course, for the individual innocent victim of the measures directed against the Jews and are even ready to help them by an unobtrusive Christian charity. The Jews as a whole, however, are, in their opinion, to be held accountable for the reaction against them, even if this should affect many innocent victims or be occasionally considered too extreme in its detailed and relentless application; but a just war does not have to be renounced or condemned merely because many innocent people may become its victims. The innocent Jewish or "non-Aryan" individual should bear the burden of his sufferings silently even if these are caused by unjust measures; he ought to regard them as an opportunity for his conversion, which is independent of his external position, or accept them as a penance for the col-

lective guilt of his ancestors and their descendants to whom he is bound by the same blood-ties. In this way racial anti-Semitism, while rejected in principle, is nevertheless unopposed in practice or, at best, opposed silently.

What should be the position of the Christian with regard to these two modern types of anti-Semitism: the one radical, founded on race and looking upon the Jew frankly and openly as a parasite, incapable of changing his nature; the other moderate, founded on a national conservatism, which frequently objects to being classed as "anti-Semitic"?

8. A Christian Criticism of Racial Anti-Semitism

The incompatibility in principle of racial anti-Semitism with the teaching of the Church is readily seen and recognized. Racial anti-Semitism denies the Christian conception of man. In its view, man is not primarily a being in need of salvation through Jesus Christ, but, first of all a member of a race expressed in terms of blood-composition and its cognate spirit. The Jew is, strictly speaking, not even human, for an authoritative comment on the Nuremberg Laws of 1933 declares: "The difference between the lowest so-called humans and our highest races is far greater than that which exists between the lowest humans and the highest apes." Baptism is unimportant; heredity is all decisive. These views are contrary to the Church's conception of the unity of mankind. In the Church's eyes, all the differences between human beings are secondary to the common end of all men, namely their Redemption, and their common creative origin, which makes Adam the progenitor of all mankind. To consider the Jew as an unconvertible parasite contradicts also the specific teaching regarding the Scriptural importance of the Jews and their final conversion, as stated above in Part I.

The tendency of racial anti-Semitism is at bottom an anti-Christian one. The whole complex of its ideology is discussed by Erich Voegelin.⁶⁸ He demonstrates that the modern racial theory is but a substitute for the lost conception of the *Corpus Christi Mysticum*. Its completely pagan dress is due to the doctrine of a superior race, *i.e.*, one "predestined" to rule. It was Fichte who first secularized the theological

⁶⁸ "Race and the State," Tuebingen, 1933.

opposites “Christ-Antichrist” by applying them to the relation of the German people to Napoleonic France, and in place of the Kingdom of God he set the Nation. In this way racial science received its pseudo-religious character. Its greatest force, however, is derived from the appropriation of Darwin’s theory of the Struggle for Existence. The alleged natural inequalities of man are not new, but a return to the ancient division of mankind into free-born and slave-born; a view which is possible only after a complete abandonment of Christian values. The discussion here cited shows that the racial theories are but a concoction of the most dangerous heresies of the past few decades and they give evidence of a total abandonment of the Christian Gospel. They are further proof that the racial theories and everything connected with them form a counter-myth which furnishes a dark background to the more shining myth of the secularized consciousness of its own people’s mission. Catholics will find such an exaggerated notion untenable, for they must realize that this hybrid is hostile to Christ; it is impossible to reconcile faith with superstition, revelation with a myth, or Christ with Antichrist.

9. Criticism of the “Moderate” Anti-Semitism

To judge “moderate” anti-Semitism, the following points are fundamental:

1. Separate measures against the Jews on account of their biblical past, as was the case in the Middle Ages, are no longer admissible in a world which does not base its public life upon Christian principles, and where similar measures against heretics and apostates are not applied. The fight against the Jews, as a social group to whom definite harmful influences are to be ascribed, must be conducted on the same principles which govern the treatment of every other group. It is not a true return to Christian public life if such a return consists merely in anti-Jewish measures and not in the elevation of Christian morality to the norm of public morality as was the case in the Middle Ages. If an attempt is made to base demands for anti-Jewish laws on the ground that such laws are still enforced within the Church with regard to Christians of Jewish origin, because the Franciscans (or Friars Minor) and Jesuits do not ad-

mit Jewish converts into their Orders, the answer is, that the Franciscans have never excluded Jewish converts. Their admission into the Order and to higher positions was made dependent on a dispensation which was in perfect conformity with the Canon Law. According to Canon 987 of C.J.C., a dispensation for Holy Orders is necessary whenever the recipient is the son of non-Catholic (*not only of Jewish*) parents. Regarding the exclusion of Jewish converts from the Jesuit Order, we find the following information given by Ludwig Koch, S.J.: ⁶⁹ "An opposition arose within the Order against the third Superior General Aquaviva, which was supported chiefly by the members of Jewish origin; they, however, claimed to have the support of King Philip II and Pope Clement VIII. Aquaviva now insisted on the exclusion from the Order of all members of Jewish descent. This was all the easier since public opinion in Spain, where the Order originated, was skeptical about the sincerity of the conversions of Jewish and Moorish descendants. The Sixth General Chapter of the Order in 1608 decided thereupon to issue a similar decree against the Moors. The General can always dispense from this restriction; there have been a number of Jewish descendants in the Order." The reasons for the exclusion, therefore, were purely domestic. Thus the policies of both these religious orders do not in any way support any political tendencies.

2. *Justice* demands that measures which deny certain rights to Jews be instituted only for reasons of proven guilt. A German Benedictine, the Rev. Dr. Alois Mager, professor at the University of Salzburg, Austria, writes as follows in the Catholic paper of Salzburg, *apropos* of the German-Jewish situation: "The question is this, whether Jews who are in fact members of the German cultural community, who are legally citizens of the State, who fulfill their civic duties in all things and do not disturb the public order, can be expelled from this cultural community and deprived of their civic rights, merely on the grounds of being Jews. I do not know how this can be justified in civic or in natural law. If the Jew exerts a degenerating and revolutionary influence, the State can have recourse to the same laws and sanctions which are applicable in the case of any other criminal; but he can never

⁶⁹ "Jesuit Encyclopedia," Cologne, ed. 1934, pp. 938-944.

become subject to punishment for the sole reason of being a Jew, instead of being a dangerous and destructive force." The "proofs of guilt" commonly adduced are, first: that Jews have been guilty on innumerable occasions of committing ritual murders and that they are still committing them, although they stubbornly deny this; secondly, that they strive for world domination, as shown in the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"; thirdly, that they regulate their lives after the post-Talmudic lawbook "Shulhan Aruch," the unmoral and inhospitable prescriptions of which make them a danger for all other nations. Concerning the ritual murder, the German historian Wilhelm Grau, who is today the official expert on Jewish questions in the Reichsinstitut for German Historical Research, and, therefore, a witness above suspicion, admits that real proof for the fact of ritual murders cannot be given.⁷⁰ The "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" have been declared to be "not only forged documents but must now be considered definitely disposed of, while their contents should not even be referred to indirectly."⁷¹ Regarding the "Shulhan Aruch," it must be said, that from the Christian viewpoint its moral doctrine is to be definitely rejected, but it cannot become a danger to public life. The reason for this is pointed out by Rev. Dr. Severin Grill, O.Cist., in his statement that "by far the overwhelming majority of Western and Central European Jews do not follow the teaching of the 'Shulhan Aruch' and its content is totally unknown to them."⁷²

Justice demands further that even the protective measures directed against those social evils of which, in practice, Jews are most frequently guilty, (e.g., the exploitation by loan sharks of peasants who are ignorant of the technical points of the credit system and thereby fall into the hands of traders and speculators with a subsequent intolerable economic dependence), must not be framed as special laws against Jews. For these are evils not merely when they are of "advantage" to Jews. Measures directed against abuses, therefore, should be aimed at these abuses and not at the Jews, otherwise they merely serve to replace Jewish exploiters and profiteers by others. The abolition of the abuses by protective measures (e.g.,

⁷⁰ "Anti-Semitismus im Spätem Mittelalter," Munich, 1934, p. 145.

⁷¹ "Studien zum Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts," in the Church Gazette of the Archdiocese of Cologne, 1935, p. 11.

⁷² "The Talmud and Shulhan Aruch," Grau, 1934, p. 21.

formation of credit unions which protect the unwary and helpless against legal sharp practice, by educative and adjustive policies which are not based on the more agile "urban" intellect), coupled with positive reforms, is more conducive to a healthy development of society and the elimination of unsound conditions, regardless of whether they are of advantage to the Jew or non-Jew. In this way certain harmful practices, if they should emanate mostly from Jews, can be abolished without those injustices which special and exclusive anti-Jewish measures entail.

3. The moderate anti-Semites, as well as the radicals who consider every Jew to be necessarily harmful by reason of his race, still recognize the need, directly or indirectly, of justifying their measures as a necessary protection and defense. Christian *prudence* at this point demands an examination of these justifying arguments based upon truth and free from all emotionalism. This results in a rejection of a method which makes all Jews responsible for the deeds of one Jew or even part-Jew. It demands a renunciation of the use of unintelligible terms, such as the so-called Jewish spirit, which is called Jewish because it is disliked. The Swedish capitalist, Kreuger, for example, is called Jewish because he perpetrated a gigantic swindle, and the non-Jew Schlick is accused of giving an example of Jewish disintegrating activities, because he propounded a "philosophy" which was anti-metaphysical and unacceptable to Christians. Furthermore the demand must be made to distinguish carefully between cause and effect. The emancipation of the Jews was an effect of the total emancipation of the European spirit from the religious influences in public life, but this total emancipation cannot be regarded as the work of the Jews; too many historical facts are against this view. Nor must it be forgotten that the elimination of the Jews from the intellectual life of Germany has not resulted in a re-Christianization of its public life. On the contrary, the process of dissolution continues and is to be continued until public life is completely de-confessionalized, which means in fact completely de-Christianized and de-humanized.

4. The general measures against the Jews, who are so defined on the basis of their descent, do not purify the public life from harmful phenomena — such as the so-called Bolshevization of culture and literature which continues to flour-

ish—but rather do they lead to the abolition of the concepts of State and Justice based upon the Natural Law. Such measures violate not only the justice due even to Jews but disturb the whole juridical and political order. Justice and State (as “institutions of force”) become instruments of force to the possessors of political power. The practice first put into effect against the Jews—namely, the deprivation of certain groups of their rights without proof of concrete guilt on the part of the responsible leaders and followers—eventually becomes a determining factor for the entire national policy, not excepting the law courts and their manner of interpreting and applying the law. The Jews are but the initial example for the use of groups as objects over which to extend, and by means of propaganda to justify, political power. The fight against them serves to unify State and people externally by concentrating on one opponent; but the accusation in its essence means the designation of a group as an “opposition” supposedly hostile to State and nation. This same accusation, however, can also be applied to other groups, for example to the Jesuits, who were so accused in the 19th century and are again so accused today; in other words, a general condemnation and a collective defamation can be put into effect against any group. In addition to this, a group can be arbitrarily “defined” by the authorities, according to propaganda purposes or political needs. Thus the fate which yesterday befell the Jews in Germany, namely the identification with every kind of enemy of the State, threatens to befall the Catholics of that country today.

5. If national racial laws should be introduced or promulgated, it will be impossible to free oneself from radical racial anti-Semitism. The latter itself is not based on fact as omissions in the racial legislation demonstrate by the inconsistent application of the racial theory. The German nation itself is a mixture of many races of allegedly different qualities and yet no distinctions are made. The inconsistency, however, goes much further. The race-scientist H. K. F. Guenther,⁷³ describes the Asia-Minor racial components of the Jewish people and adds: “The Armenians are a people with the strongest predominance of the Asia-Minor race.” In spite of this, there is no sign of any special legislation

⁷³ “Die Rassenkunde des Jüdischen Volkes,” 2nd ed., p. 27, 1930.

against Armenians, just as the totally alien Japanese and Hungarians do not fall under any German racial legislation. This fact proves that the race laws and the race teachings are not a product of scientific research but are prompted by quite different motives from those generally advanced. Besides, the damage done by any special legislation directed against the Jews in general is greater than any application in the case of any truly culpable and, therefore, punishable Jews. Such culpable Jews can be, and must be, punished without recourse to general anti-Jewish laws. Special legislation leads to collective defamation and expropriation which causes a general demoralization. Among the Jews it means that those individuals will fare best who are least sensitive to insults, slander, etc., and who can make themselves indispensable by exploiting troublesome situations. Among non-Jews, social strife is disguised with moral arguments; by pointing to the Jews as the chief instigators of all evils in public life, many consider themselves dispensed from the necessity of examining their own conscience. An atmosphere of hatred is generated and justified; this is so in spite of the fact that such hatred is denied on the ground that the legislation is directed against alien elements who individually are not responsible for their harmful characteristics. Such an atmosphere of hatred is contrary to the Christian law of charity. The Jew is forced into a degrading situation, not because he does not wish to convert himself, as was the reason advanced in the Middle Ages, and because thereby he delayed the second coming of our Lord which would bring to him also salvation; the reason is rather because one desires to live well here below, because one considers it necessary to have a group against which one can prove one's substantial superiority, even though this be done without personal effort and achievement. Such a viewpoint does not see in the Jew a neighbor but a social and political object. The general anti-Jewish mentality and its corresponding legislation signify an attitude of mind which is concerned only with things of this world, *i.e.*, with power and prestige as ends in themselves, in spite of all theoretical explanations and principles.

10. *Duties of Christians*

The above exposition, as well as the other facts in this Memorial, have been written out of love for truth and justice. *From it one may readily deduce that it is the bounden duty of every Christian today to expose, wherever and whenever this may be necessary, all the errors inherent in the practical political side of the contemporary Jewish question.* It is likewise necessary to deny one's support to any anti-Semitic policy and, where the possession of political influence makes this possible, to combat all anti-Semitic moves. While it is necessary to introduce measures for the purpose of economic recovery, for the reconstruction of the social order, for the Christianization of our intellectual and cultural life, experience has shown that "legislating against the Jews" does not in the least contribute toward the attainment of those ends. On the contrary, by ostracizing the Jews, incalculable damage, temporally and spiritually, is done to the nation. Such laws are enacted only for the sake of providing a scapegoat and to unite the people against an allegedly common foe instead of striving for positive aims. This applies to all nations which legislate against Jews and against so-called "non-Aryans." *As Christians we must exert ourselves to the utmost in order to dispel the prevalent poisonous atmosphere of falsehood and hate.* Wherever the Christian himself is deprived of his rights and is without political influence, he should assist in individual cases, especially and primarily the Christian non-Aryans who wander through the world today a homeless people. These should be helped by the creation of possible settlements, by the establishment of a world-wide employment service and similar practical measures. To these we are first obliged to show consideration, because they are our brothers and sisters in the spirit and in the faith; it is they who have suffered most of all from the current anti-Jewish legislation in Germany.

If in this pamphlet we raise our voice against the errors in vogue today regarding the Jewish question as a mystery of faith, we do so because these errors ultimately threaten the life of our faith, and also on account of the un-Christian hatred prevalent in public life, where instead of the desired order envisioned by the Psalmist: "Justice and Peace have kissed,"⁷⁴ we have today an unhappy "friend-foe-relation"

⁷⁴ Psalms lxxxvii.

which constantly demands a new object of its hatred as soon as one "foe" has been disposed of; in this way it tries to perpetuate its war. We protest, further, against the ostracism of the Jews and the special measures against them which are also directed against all of us, because they are neither protective nor justifiable defensive measures; they are aimed only at defamation and destruction. We raise our voice in protest against all this, although there may still be some who will say that, while the Jews may now suffer unjustly they have no right to expect us Christians to defend them, since they were silent when the persecutions in Mexico and Russia were at their height, and that, with few exceptions, they are still silent today and will probably continue to be silent. This may be disputed; but even if it were true, it offers no reason why we should be guilty of the same "boycott of silence" of which Pope Pius XI complained with justified bitterness. Do not Truth and Justice deserve to be championed at all times? For this reason we have confessed and testified. On this question today, every Christian should also confess and testify out of obedience to the Word of God: "For if you love them that love you, what reward shall you have? Do not even the publicans this? And if you salute your brethren only, what do you more? Do not also the heathens this? Be you, therefore, perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect."⁷⁵

75 Matt. v. 46-48.

REV. DR. SILVESTER BRAITO, O.P., Olmouce (Czecho-Slovakia).

A leading figure of a Catholic Renaissance in Czecho-Slovakia. The editor of a Czech translation of the *Summa* of St. Thomas, and editor-in-chief of an ascetical Review in Czech: *Na Hlubinu*.

PROFESSOR EDGAR DE BRUYNE, Bruxelles (Belgium).

A prominent Catholic philosopher at the University of Ghent. Author of many books, particularly of a complete work on Ethics. An influential member of the Catholic Party in Belgium.

THE Catholic Association for International Peace has grown out of a series of meetings during 1926-1927. Following the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in 1926, representatives of a dozen nations met with American for discussion. In October of the same year a meeting was held in Cleveland where a temporary organization called The Catholic Committee on International Relations was formed. The permanent name, The Catholic Association for International Peace, was adopted at a two-day Conference in Washington in 1927. Since 1927 the Association has held the following Conferences: nine Annual, in Washington, one in Cleveland and one in New York; four Regional, at St. Louis University, Notre Dame University, Marquette University and Villanova College; and eleven Student, in various sections of the country. It is a membership organization. Its objects and purposes are:

- To study, disseminate and apply the principles of natural law and Christian charity to international problems of the day;
- To consider the moral and legal aspects of any action which may be proposed or advocated in the international sphere;
- To examine and consider issues which bear upon international good will;
- To encourage the formation of conference, lectures and study circles;
- To issue reports on questions of international importance;
- To further, in coöperation with similar Catholic organizations in other countries, in accord with the teachings of the Church, the object and purposes of world peace and happiness.

The ultimate purpose is to promote, in conformity with the mind of the Church, "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ."

The Association works through the preparation of committee reports. Following careful preparation, these are discussed both publicly and privately in order to secure able revision and they are then published by the organization. Additional committees will be created from time to time. The Association solicits the membership and coöperation of Catholics of like mind. It is seeking especially the membership and coöperation of those whose experience and studies are such that they can take part in the preparation of committee reports.

The Committees on Ethics, Law and Organization, and Economic Relations, serve as a guiding committee on the particular questions for all other committees. Questions involving moral judgments must be submitted to the Committee on Ethics.

Publications of the Catholic Association for International Peace

PAMPHLET SERIES—

- No. 1—International Ethics.
- No. 2—Latin America and the United States.
- No. 3—Causes of War, and Security, Old and New.
- No. 4—Haiti, Past and Present (out of print).
- No. 5—Francis de Vitoria (out of print).
- No. 6—American Agriculture and International Affairs.
- No. 7—Puerto Rico and the United States (out of print).
- No. 8—Europe and the United States—Elements in Their Relationship.
- No. 9—The Ethics of War.
- No. 10—National Attitudes in Children (out of print).
- No. 11—Tariffs and World Peace.
- No. 12—Manchuria—The Problem in the Far East.
- No. 13—International Economic Life.
- No. 14—The Church and Peace Efforts.
- No. 15—War and Peace in St. Augustine's "De Civitate Dei."
- No. 16—Peace Education in Catholic Schools.
- No. 17—Peace Action of Benedict XV.
- No. 18—Relations Between France and Italy.
- No. 19—Catholic Organization for Peace in Europe.
- No. 20—The United States and the Dominican Republic.
- No. 21—An Introduction to Mexico.
- No. 22—A Papal Peace Mosaic.
- No. 23—Arbitration and the World Court.
- No. 24—Agriculture and International Life.
- No. 25—Patriotism, Nationalism, and the Brotherhood of Man.
- No. 26—The Church and the Jews.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES—

- Appeals for Peace of Pope Benedict XV and Pope Pius XI.
- Argentina—Land of the Eucharistic Congress, 1934.
- Catholic Primer of Peace.
- Peace Trends.
- Permanent Peace Program of Pope Benedict XV.
- Syllabus on International Relations.

REPORTS IN PREPARATION—

- World Society—Symposium.
- Catholicism—the Keynote of Pan Americanism.
- Disarmament and Catholic Doctrine.
- International Cultural Relations.
- So-called "Over-Population."
- Trends in International Labor Legislation.

BOOKS—

- The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations—John Eppstein.
- The Peace Efforts of the Church During the Last Three Hundred Years
—Joseph Muller.

N. C. W. C. JOINT COMMITTEE ON PEACE—

- Peace Statements of Recent Popes.
- The Christian Way to Peace.